```
ANDRÉ BIROTTE JR.
1
   United States Attorney
   LEON W. WEIDMAN
   Assistant United States Attorney
   Chief, Civil Division
3
   ERIKA JOHNSON-BROOKS
4
   Assistant United States Attorney
   California Bar Number: 210908
5
         Federal Building, Suite 7516
         300 North Los Angeles Street
6
        Los Angeles, California 90012
        Telephone: (213) 894-0474
7
         Facsimile: (213) 894-7819
        Erika.Johnson@usdoj.gov
8
   Attorneys for Defendant
9
   United States of America
10
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11
                 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12
                                      No. EDCV 10-00239 AHM (DTB)
    DEREK A. CAPOZZI,
13
                    Plaintiff,
14
                                         ANSWER TO FOURTH
                                         AMENDED COMPLAINT
15
    UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
16
                    Defendant.
17
18
```

Defendant, United States of America (hereinafter "Defendant"), in response to Plaintiff's Complaint (hereinafter "Complaint"), and without waiving the below-listed affirmative defenses, hereby admits, denies and answers the Complaint as follows:

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 1. Answering the allegations in paragraph one, Defendant states that this paragraph contains Plaintiff's allegations regarding jurisdiction to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Defendant admits these allegations.
  - 2. Answering the allegations in paragraph two, Defendant

- 3. Answering the allegations in paragraph three, Defendant admits that Plaintiff was incarcerated at USP Victorville, which is located in Adelanto, California and operated by the Federal Bureau of Prisons, on May 18, 2008. Defendant admits that Plaintiff is currently incarcerated at USP Lewisburg located in Lewisburg, Pennsylvania.
- 4. Answering the allegations in paragraph four, Defendant admits these allegations.
- 5. Answering the allegations in paragraph five, Defendant admits these allegations.
- 6. Answering the allegations in paragraph six, Defendant avers that USP Victorville is a high security facility which houses male inmates.
- 7. Answering the allegations in paragraph seven, Defendant states that this paragraph contains Plaintiff's legal conclusions and characterization of his action to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Defendant denies these allegations.
- 8. Answering the allegations in paragraph eight, Defendant states that this paragraph contains Plaintiff's legal conclusions and characterization of his action to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Defendant denies these allegations.
- 9. Answering the allegations in paragraph nine, Defendant admits these allegations.

10. Answering the allegations in paragraph ten, Defendant avers that metal detectors are located at the entrance of each housing unit at USP Victorville with the exception of the Special Housing Unit.

- 11. Answering the allegations in paragraph eleven,
  Defendant avers that current general post orders for the housing
  units at the Federal Correctional Complex at Victorville,
  California indicate that the unit officer should monitor incoming
  and outgoing traffic of the housing units, randomly conducting
  pat searches and if a metal detector is present, ensuring each
  inmate is clearing it. Defendant currently lacks sufficient
  information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations
  regarding May 18, 2008 protocol and therefore denies allegations
  referring to protocol in place during that time.
- 12. Answering the allegations in paragraph twelve,
  Defendant avers that current general post orders for housing
  units at the Federal Correctional Complex at Victorville,
  California indicate that the unit officer should monitor incoming
  and outgoing traffic of the housing units, randomly conducting
  pat searches and if a metal detector is present, ensuring each
  inmate is clearing it. Defendant currently lacks sufficient
  information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations
  regarding May 18, 2008 protocol and therefore denies allegations
  referring to protocol in place during that time.
- 13. Answering the allegations in paragraph thirteen,

  Defendant avers that current general post orders for housing

  units at the Federal Correctional Complex at Victorville,

  California indicate that the unit officer should monitor incoming

and outgoing traffic of the housing units, randomly conducting pat searches and if a metal detector is present, ensuring each inmate is clearing it. Currently, if a metal detector sounds an alert tone, an officer should request another staff member to assist him/her with a wall search of the inmate in the Unit Officer's Office, but Defendant lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding May 18, 2008 protocol and therefore denies allegations referring to protocol in place during that time.

- 14. Answering the allegations in paragraph fourteen,
  Defendant currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief
  as to the truth of the allegations and therefore denies the
  allegations.
- 15. Answering the allegations in paragraph fifteen,

  Defendant currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief
  as to the truth of the allegations and therefore denies the
  allegations.
- 16. Answering the allegations in paragraph sixteen,

  Defendant currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief
  as to the truth of the allegations and therefore denies the
  allegations.
- 17. Answering the allegations in paragraph seventeen,

  Defendant currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief
  as to the truth of the allegations and therefore denies the
  allegations.
- 18. Answering the allegations in paragraph eighteen,
  Defendant currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief
  as to the truth of the allegations and therefore denies the

allegations.

- 19. Answering the allegations in paragraph nineteen,
  Defendant avers that both Plaintiff and another inmate were armed
  with weapons on May 18, 2008. These weapons were an 8 inch ice
  pick type-weapon with a black lanyard and a 6 inch weapon with a
  serrated blade, a sharpened edge with a point on one end and a
  black boot string attached as a lanyard.
- 20. Answering the allegations in paragraph twenty,
  Defendant avers that after the altercation between Plaintiff and
  the other inmate on May 18, 2008, N. Blier, R.N., conducted
  medical assessments on both inmates. Defendant avers that
  Plaintiff sustained several lacerations and puncture wounds on
  his chest, neck, and right arm on May 18, 2008. Defendant avers
  that Plaintiff also sustained scratches on his nose on May 18,
  2008. As to the balance of the allegations stated in paragraph
  twenty, Defendant currently lacks sufficient information to form
  a belief as to the truth of the allegations and therefore denies
  the balance of the allegations.
- 21. Answering the allegations in paragraph twenty-one,
  Defendant currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief
  as to the truth of the allegations and therefore denies the
  allegations.
- 22. Answering the allegations in paragraph twenty-two,
  Defendant avers that Plaintiff was transported to Loma Linda
  University Medical Center and Children's Hospital for emergency
  treatment on May 18, 2008. Defendant avers that documentation
  from Loma Linda University Medical Center and Children's Hospital
  indicates that Plaintiff was discharged from the hospital on May

- 23. Answering the allegations in paragraph twenty-three,
  Defendant currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief
  as to the truth of the allegations and therefore denies the
  allegations.
- 24. Answering the allegations in paragraph twenty-four,
  Defendant currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief
  as to the truth of the allegations and therefore denies the
  allegations.
- 25. Answering the allegations in paragraph twenty-five, Defendant avers that after the altercation between Plaintiff and the other inmate on May 18, 2008, N. Blier, R.N., conducted medical assessments on both inmates. Defendant avers that Plaintiff sustained several lacerations and puncture wounds on his chest, neck, and right arm on May 18, 2008. Defendant avers that Plaintiff also sustained scratches on his nose on May 18, 2008. As to the balance of the allegations stated in paragraph twenty-five, Defendant currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations and therefore denies the balance of the allegations.
- 26. Answering the allegations in paragraph twenty-six,

  Defendant currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief
  as to the truth of the allegations and therefore denies the
  allegations.
- 27. Answering the allegations in paragraph twenty-seven,
  Defendant currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief
  as to the truth of the allegations and therefore denies the

allegations.

7 II

- 28. Answering the allegations in paragraph twenty-eight,
  Defendant currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief
  as to the truth of the allegations and therefore denies the
  allegations.
- 29. Answering the allegations in paragraph twenty-nine,
  Defendant states that this paragraph contains Plaintiff's legal
  conclusions and characterization of his action, to which no
  response is required. To the extent that a response is required,
  current post orders state that if a metal detector sounds an
  alert tone, an officer should request another staff member to
  assist him/her with a wall search of the inmate in the Unit
  Officer's Office, but Defendant lacks sufficient information to
  form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding May
  18, 2008 protocol and therefore denies allegations referring to
  protocol in place during that time.
- 30. Answering the allegations in paragraph thirty,

  Defendant states that this paragraph contains Plaintiff's legal

  conclusions and characterization of his action, to which no

  response is required. To the extent that a response is required,

  Defendant denies the allegations.
- 31. Answering the allegations in paragraph thirty-one,
  Defendant states that this paragraph contains Plaintiff's legal
  conclusions and characterization of his action, to which no
  response is required. To the extent that a response is required,
  Defendant avers that Housing Unit Officers assigned to inmate
  housing units have the responsibility for maintaining good order,
  security, and high levels of sanitation in the unit at all times.

- 33. Answering the allegations in paragraph thirty-three, Defendant avers that USP Victorville staff can be comprised of contract employees, typically in the medical profession, as well as staff employed by the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Defendant currently lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations that all USP Victorville staff on May 18, 2008 were employed by the Federal Bureau of Prisons and therefore denies the allegations.
- 34. Answering the allegations in paragraph thirty-four,
  Defendant states that this paragraph contains Plaintiff's legal
  conclusions and characterization of his action, to which no
  response is required. To the extent that a response is required,
  Defendant denies the allegations.
- 35. Answering the allegations in paragraph thirty-five,
  Defendant states that this paragraph contains Plaintiff's legal
  conclusions and characterization of his action, to which no
  response is required. To the extent that a response is required,
  Defendant denies the allegations.
- 36. Answering the allegations in paragraph thirty-six,

  Defendant states that this paragraph contains Plaintiff's legal

  conclusions and characterization of his action, to which no

  response is required. To the extent that a response is required,

Defendant denies the allegations.

- 37. Answering the allegations in paragraph thirty-seven,
  Defendant states that this paragraph contains Plaintiff's legal
  conclusions and characterization of his action, to which no
  response is required. To the extent that a response is required,
  Defendant denies the allegations.
- 38. Answering the allegations in paragraph thirty-eight, Defendant admits these allegations.
- 39. Answering the allegations in paragraph thirty-nine which incorporates paragraphs 1-38, Defendant states no response is necessary as Defendant has responded to paragraphs 1-38. To the extent that any response is required Defendant refers to its responses in paragraphs 1-38.
- 40. Answering the allegations in paragraph forty, Defendant states that this paragraph contains Plaintiff's legal conclusions and characterization of his action, to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Defendant denies the allegations.
- 41. Answering the allegations in paragraph forty-one,
  Defendant states that this paragraph contains Plaintiff's legal
  conclusions and characterization of his action, to which no
  response is required. To the extent that a response is required,
  Defendant denies the allegations.
- 42. Answering the allegations in paragraph forty-two,
  Defendant states that this paragraph contains Plaintiff's legal
  conclusions and characterization of his action, to which no

response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Defendant denies the allegations.

The remaining allegations contain a Prayer for Relief, to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Defendant denies the allegations.

Defendant alleges the following separate and affirmative defenses as the claims in Plaintiff's Complaint:

## FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

## SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Defendant and its agents, servants and employees exercised due care and diligence in all matters alleged in the Complaint, and acted within the applicable standard of care. Defendant and its agents, servants and employees deny committing any negligent or wrongful act or omission and deny causing and/or contributing to the damages complained of in the Complaint. No act or failure to act by Defendant, its agents or employees, was the legal cause of any loss or damage to Plaintiff.

## THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

In the event Defendant is found to be negligent, which negligence Defendant denies, the negligence of Plaintiff and/or other third party contributed to and/or caused his damages, and any recovery must be proportionately reduced.

#### FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's damages, if any, are limited to the amount

claimed administratively, under the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C  $\S$  2675(b).

# FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's damages, if any, have been caused at least in part by his failure to mitigate damages.

### SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's alleged injuries, if any, were proximately caused by his own negligent or otherwise wrongful conduct.

## SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

To the extent that Plaintiff seeks pre-judgment interest or any other monetary amounts not provided for by law, Plaintiff fails to state a claim for which relief can be granted and the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over the Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C § 2674.

#### EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff is not entitled to a jury trial pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2402.

#### NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Defendant asserts the jurisdictional defense of discretionary function which cannot be waived and may be raised at any time.

## TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The United States has not waived sovereign immunity for the payment of attorney's fees in tort cases against it pursuant to 28 U.S.C. \$2412 (d) (1) (A).

ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Defendant contests the extent of Plaintiff's claimed injuries, whatever they may be, as well as Plaintiff's assertion that said injuries, resulting treatment, alleged requirement for future treatment and/or residual effects were caused by the incident referenced in Plaintiff's Complaint.

### TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's damages, if any, must be reduced by any collateral source as required by law.

WHEREFORE, Defendant prays for judgment against Plaintiff as follows:

- That Plaintiff's Complaint and each cause of action contained therein be dismissed with prejudice.
  - 2. That Plaintiff take nothing by his Complaint;
- That Defendant be awarded costs incurred herein; 3. and
- That the Court order such other and further 4. relief for Defendant as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: June 11, 2012 ANDRÉ BIROTTE JR.

United States Attorney

LEON W. WEIDMAN

Assistant United States Attorney Chief, Civil Division

/s/ Erika Johnson-Brooks

ERIKA JOHNSON-BROOKS Assistant United States Attorney

Attorneys for Defendant United States of America

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27